

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION

KEVIN MAURICE WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff

VS.

MRS. CANTY, *et al.*,

Defendants

NO. 5:05-CV-310 (CAR)

PROCEEDINGS UNDER 42 U.S.C. §1983
BEFORE THE U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ORDER

Defendants in the above-styled case have filed a motion seeking to compel discovery from plaintiff KEVIN MAURICE WILLIAMS. Tab #55. Plaintiff acknowledges that he has not provided the information, citing that the discovery requests were untimely filed, coming two weeks before the 180 day period afforded to the parties to seek discovery was to close. *See* August 18th Order Reopening Discovery, Tab #45. Notwithstanding the interpretation of any federal or local rules, the plain language of the court's August 18th 2006 order states that parties shall seek discovery within the time period set forth in that order. The defendants requests for discovery, which came within the time period prescribed, were therefore timely.

Accordingly, defendants' motion to compel discovery responses (Tab #55) is **GRANTED** and plaintiff is **ORDERED WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the date of this order to respond to the discovery requests. Because the plaintiff's failure to respond to discovery requests was not the result of bad faith, plaintiff has not waived his objections to any discovery requests.

Notwithstanding the scheduling and discovery order heretofore entered (Tab #58), dispositive motions shall be filed no later than **July 20, 2007** and any Daubert motions must be filed on or before **July 6, 2007**.

SO ORDERED this 10th day of MAY, 2007.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Claude W. Hicks, Jr.".

CLAUDE W. HICKS, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE